

Final Scores on Proposals for Debt Collection Services by Law Firms [RFP #2010-100]						Average Scores from 7 Evaluators ----- Law Firms -----			
RFP Sec. #				TECHNICAL PROPOSAL [Scored by the Evaluation Committee before opening the <u>Cost Proposals</u> ]	Max. Points	Linebarger Goggan et al	Litow & Pech	Willson & Pechacek	
3	2	1		Mandatory documents/responses (3.2.1 - 3.2.7) Transmittal letter signed by authorized agent of LF (Y / N)	NA	Y	Y	Y	
3	2	2		Background Information on Law Firm					
3	2	2	1	Law firm's name, address, telephone #, fax #, email (Y / N)	NA	Y	Y	Y	
3	2	2	2	Form of business entity (Y / N)	NA	Y	Y	Y	
3	2	2	3	State of incorporation (Y / N)	NA	Y	Y	Y	
3	2	2	4	Law firm's contact for tech matters: Name, address, tele # (Y / N)	NA	Y	Y	Y	
3	2	2	5	Law firm is (or will be) registered to do biz in IA. If already registered, provide regis. date & name of registered agent (Y / N)	NA	Y	Y	Y	
3	2	2	6	Names and contact info for director/mgr of all other state/regional law firm offices (Y / N)	NA	Y	Y	Y	
3	2	2	7	# of lawyers, tech staff, & other support staff in each of law firm's offices	15	15.0	9.4	7.4	
3	2	3		Termination, debarment, and litigation. Law firm must provide the following info for the <u>past 5 years</u> :					
3	2	3	1	Has LF had a contract for services terminated for any reason? - If YES, provide details	25	20.9	25.0	25.0	
3	2	3	2	Describe <u>damages or penalties</u> assessed against, or <u>settlements</u> entered into by LF arising from <u>any existing or past contracts for goods or services</u> . -- Provide <u>full details</u> about each of these incidents	25	25.0	25.0	25.0	
3	2	3	3	Describe any <u>order</u> , <u>judgment</u> , or <u>decree</u> of any fed or state authority barring, suspending, or limiting the LF's right to engage in any business, practice, or activity	25	25.0	25.0	25.0	
3	2	3	4	A list & summary of <u>all litigation</u> or threatened litigation, <u>administrative</u> , or <u>regulatory proceedings</u> , or similar matters to which the LF or its officers have been a party	25	20.7	19.3	22.4	

Final Scores on Proposals for Debt Collection Services by Law Firms [RFP #2010-100]						Average Scores from 7 Evaluators ----- <i>Law Firms</i> -----			
RFP Sec. #				TECHNICAL PROPOSAL [Scored by the Evaluation Committee before opening the <u>Cost Proposals</u> ]		Max. Points	Linebarger Goggan et al	Litow & Pech	Willson & Pechacek
3	2	3	5	Any <u>irregularities discovered in any of the accounts</u> maintained by LF on behalf of others. -- Describe the <u>circumstances and disposition</u> of each irregularity		25	25.0	25.0	25.0
3	2	3	6	List & summary of all <u>Fair Debt Coll. Practices Act complaints</u> , <u>consumer protection complaints</u> , or similar complaints to which LF or its attorneys have been a party		25	21.0	19.6	25.0
3	2	3	7	List & summary of all lawyer <u>ethics or grievance complaints</u> to which the LF or its attorneys have been a party		25	18.6	17.1	23.6
3	2	4		Experience collecting debt					
3	2	4	1	# of years in biz as a LF [1 pt per each year over 5 yrs; 10 pts max.]		10	10.0	10.0	10.0
3	2	4	2	# of years providing <u>debt collection services</u> [2 pts/yr; 30 pts max]		30	30.0	27.0	30.0
3	2	4	3	# of years collecting <u>court debt</u> [2.5 pts/yr; 10 or more = 25 pts]		25	25.0	0.0	0.0
3	2	4	4	Name, city, state of courts where LF has collected debt in past 5 years; plus name, title, phone # of a contact person in each court		5	5.0	0.0	0.0
				>> Plus - amount of court debt assigned to LF by each court & amount collected		30	24.7	0.0	0.0
3	2	4	5	# of years collecting debt for <u>other govt agencies</u> [1 pt / year; 20 pts max.]		20	20.0	0.0	0.0
3	2	4	6	Name, city, state of <u>other govt agencies</u> where LF has collected debt in past <u>5 years</u> ; plus name, title, phone # of a <u>contact person in each agency</u>		5	5.0	0.0	0.0
				>> Plus - amount of debt assigned to LF by each agency & amount collected		20	14.0	0.0	0.0
3	2	4	7	Name, city, state of <u>other courts &amp; govt agencies</u> where LF has <u>EVER</u> collected debt <u>where debtors had to pay the court/agency directly -- not the law firm</u> ; plus name, title, phone # of a <u>contact person in each agency</u>		5	5.0	0.0	0.0

Final Scores on Proposals for Debt Collection Services by Law Firms [RFP #2010-100]						Average Scores from 7 Evaluators ----- Law Firms -----			
RFP Sec. #			TECHNICAL PROPOSAL [Scored by the Evaluation Committee before opening the <u>Cost Proposals</u> ]	Max. Points	Linebarger Goggan et al	Litow & Pech	Willson & Pechacek		
			>> Plus - <u>amount of debt assigned</u> to LF by <u>each court</u> or <u>agency</u> & <u>amount collected</u> in this manner	20	13.0	0.0	0.0		
3	2	5	Specifications & technical requirements -- Must comply with each requirement in 4.3.1	NA	Y	Y	Y		
3	2	6	Law firm's technology -- Must comply with each requirement in 4.3.2	NA	Y	Y	Y		
3	2	7	Personal credit information compliance - Must comply with each requirement in 4.3.3	NA	Y	Y	Y		
3	2	8	CONTRACT RISK [10% of ALL points]: Acceptance of terms & conditions -- must specifically agree with terms in <u>sec. 6</u> of RFP (Accept ALL = 120 pts)	120	120.0	120.0	113.6		
3	2	9	Certification letter (Attachment 1) must be signed by LF rep (Y/N)	NA	Y	Y	Y		
3	2	10	Authorization to release info (Attachment 2) must be signed by LF rep (Y/N)	NA	Y	Y	Y		
3	2	11	Firm proposal terms: LF must sign <u>written guarantee</u> that terms in proposal will be <u>firm</u> for a min. of 120 days following deadline for submitting proposals (July 23) - (Y/N)	NA	Y	Y	Y		
4			MANDATORY PASS/FAIL REQUIREMENTS						
4	2	1	All LF's lawyers who will provide debt collect services are authorized to practice law in IA -- and are in good standing (P/F)	NA	P	P	P		
4	2	2	All <u>non-lawyers</u> providing debt collection services will work under <u>direct supervision</u> of IA-licensed lawyers (P/F)	NA	P	P	P		
4	2	3	LF must have a <u>minimum 5 years of debt collection experience</u> (P/F)	NA	P	P	P		
4	2	4	LF must be <u>qualified to collect debt in all 50 states</u> (P/F)	NA	P	P	P		

Final Scores on Proposals for Debt Collection Services by Law Firms [RFP #2010-100]						Average Scores from 7 Evaluators ----- Law Firms -----			
RFP Sec. #		TECHNICAL PROPOSAL [Scored by the Evaluation Committee before opening the <u>Cost Proposals</u> ]				Max. Points	Linebarger Goggan et al	Litow & Pech	Willson & Pechacek
4	3				<b>Mandatory scored tech requirements</b>				
4	3	1			<b>Technical understanding and approach</b>				
4	3	1	1		Must demonstrate that LF understands the nuances of debt collection and how to implement effective debt collection programs	25	25.0	20.7	15.0
4	3	1	2		Must describe work plan and methodology to implement collection of assigned court debt	25	25.0	19.0	14.4
					>> Plus estimate of % of assigned court debt (ACD) that law firm believes it might collect	15	11.0	2.1	8.4
4	3	1	3		Must identify <u>key staff</u> - including <u>IA attorneys</u> , <u>lead collectors</u> , & <u>info tech staff</u>	15	15.0	14.3	13.1
4	3	1	4		Must describe LF's capacity to collect ACD, including the <u># of staff that will collect ACD</u>	25	25.0	17.9	10.3
4	3	1	5		Must identify <u>multi-lingual staff</u> that will provide debt collection srvs	10	9.3	5.1	1.4
4	3	1	6		Describe how LF will <u>integrate</u> with JB's admin applications and <u>comply with JB info security policies</u> -- based on prior DC experiences	25	23.6	17.0	7.9
4	3	1	7		Explain the policies and procedures LF will employ to ensure <u>compliance with Fair Debt Coll. Practices Act</u>	25	25.0	18.3	12.3
4	3	1	8		Explain LF's <u>transition plan</u> to begin DC services	25	25.0	17.1	8.1
4	3	1	9		Describe <u>reports</u> that LF will need from the JB -- due to all payments being deposited into State of IA accts, plus reports that the <u>LF will provide to the JB</u>	25	25.0	18.3	12.1
4	3	2			<b>Law firm's technology -- Describe:</b>				
4	3	2	1		LF's computer system and update capabilities, operating systems, hardware, security software, and procedures & policies	25	24.3	17.6	12.1
4	3	2	2		LF's ability to maintain records of placement, collections recover, producing reports, and billing an any unlimited # of debtors	25	25.0	17.6	12.1
4	3	2	3		LF's computer backup capabilities & methods to ensure safety, recoverability & security of JB records	25	25.0	17.9	12.9

Final Scores on Proposals for Debt Collection Services by Law Firms [RFP #2010-100]						Average Scores from 7 Evaluators ----- Law Firms -----			
RFP Sec. #				TECHNICAL PROPOSAL [Scored by the Evaluation Committee before opening the <u>Cost Proposals</u> ]		Max. Points	Linebarger Goggan et al	Litow & Pech	Willson & Pechacek
4	3	2	4	LF's data security processes, policies and personnel security		25	24.6	18.9	14.7
4	3	2	5	LF's security processes to ensure the security of JB data, customer info, data reliability, and computer system, including security requirements for access to its system by LF's employees		25	24.6	18.9	15.7
4	3	2	6	LF's data breach response plan and notification process currently in place		25	24.3	19.6	11.0
4	3	2	7	Modes of data transmission employed in the conduct of business with reference entities		15	15.0	12.1	5.4
4	3	2	8	How the LF proposes to accept and process JB data, such as data record formrts: XML, ASCII flat files, secure FTP		25	24.3	20.7	12.9
4	3	2	9	Details of the automated systems that LF will use to enhance debt collection activities, such as interactive voice response system, web-based credit or debit card systems, and call distributors		25	24.3	17.6	7.9
4	3	2	10	Examples of <u>reports to existing customers</u> ; reports should include collection rates by debt age, audit records and reports, debt accepted for collections, debt returned at JB request		25	25.0	6.4	2.1
4	3	3		Payment Card Industries (PCI) compliance -- Must describe LF's PCI compliance policies & proceedures		25	25.0	21.4	16.4

Final Scores on Proposals for Debt Collection Services by Law Firms [RFP #2010-100]			Average Scores from 7 Evaluators ----- Law Firms -----		
RFP Sec. #	TECHNICAL PROPOSAL [Scored by the Evaluation Committee before opening the <u>Cost Proposals</u> ]	Max. Points	Linebarger Goggan et al	Litow & Pech	Willson & Pechacek
<b>COST PROPOSAL</b> [Opened and scored <u>after</u> final scoring of Technical Proposals]					
<b>3.3 &amp; 1.3.6*</b>	<b><u>Cost Proposal</u> [20% of all points]*</b> (1) Must express costs as a % of the assigned court debt collected by LF; (2) May also include offer of an initial fee in sec. 1.3.6.	<b>240</b>	<b>185.0</b>	<b>165.0</b>	<b>220.0</b>
<p><b>*NOTE:</b> Cost proposals were delivered to, and held in a secure location by, the Clerk of the Supreme Court until the Evaluation Committee completed its scoring of the Technical Proposals.</p> <p><b>Scoring criteria:</b> For (1) -- the lowest % fee gets 220 pts; drop 22 pts for each 1% above the lowest fee. For (2) -- the highest initial fee gets 20 pts; other LFs receive pts in proportion to the highest fee (e.g., if \$50,000 is the highest initial fee offered, an offer of \$25,000 would get 10 pts).</p>					

<b>Total Scores by Scoring Criteria (RFP sec. 5.4)</b>	Max. Points	Linebarger et al	Litow & Pech	Willson & Pechacek
<b>Technical understanding &amp; approach (4.3.1 thru 4.3.3) -- 40%</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>470.1</b>	<b>338.4</b>	<b>226.4</b>
<b>Law firm experience &amp; capacity (3.2.2 thru 3.2.4) -- 30%</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>322.9</b>	<b>202.4</b>	<b>218.4</b>
<b>Cost (1.3.6 &amp; 3.3) -- 20%</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>185.0</b>	<b>165.0</b>	<b>220.0</b>
<b>Contract risk (3.2.8) -- 10%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120.0</b>	<b>120.0</b>	<b>113.6</b>
<b>Total points</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>1098.0</b>	<b>825.9</b>	<b>775.6</b>